



## Planning and Environmental Quality

June 24, 2003

### INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROCESSING RECORDS OF DECISION

Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) follow a standard notification process that begins with a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS, followed by preparation of Notices of Availability (NOA) for the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements, and concludes with publication of the Record of Decision (ROD). These instructions will cover processing the Record of Decision. Please see similar instructions on the Intermountain Intranet for processing Notices of Intent and Notices of Availability. These instructions are also available on the Intranet at <http://im.den.nps.gov> (click on the box to the right of Planning & Env Quality, then click on Tools and scroll down to Environmental Quality Tools) or contact Planning Technician Roxanne Runkel at (303) 969-2377 or by e-mail for a copy.

**The required 30-day no-action period must be expired before the Record of Decision is signed** (Director's Order-12: *Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis, and Decision-Making Handbook* §4.8.C). The Record of Decision cannot be signed until 30 calendar days from the day the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Notice of Availability for the Final Environmental Impact Statement is published in the *Federal Register*.

#### 1. Prepare the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Regional Director's signature.

We have provided a template for your use (**example 1**).

#### 2. Prepare the Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Regional Director's Signature.

DO-12 requires that the ROD, or a summary of it, be published in the *Federal Register* (§6.2C).

**We strongly encourage you to summarize the ROD, rather than reprinting the entire ROD.** A summary of the ROD will need to be prepared in the NOA format for publication in the *Federal Register*. Be certain that all documents conform to the publication requirements for the *Federal Register*. We suggest you use our fill-in-the-blank ROD NOA (**example 2**). If you do not use the fill-in-the-blank NOA, you will need to send the ROD NOA to the Regional Solicitor's Office for approval prior to submittal. This will take about 30 days. For more information, you may access the *Document Drafting Handbook* via the internet at <http://www.archives.gov> select "Federal Register," and then "Document Drafting Handbook." All notices must be **single-sided and double-spaced** and will require the Regional Director's signature.

Parks may e-mail the ROD, NOA, and the briefing statement to the Intermountain Support Office in order to obtain the Regional Director's signature. After the signature is obtained, the NOA will be mailed back to the sender so that the transmittal package can be completed and mailed to the *Federal Register* Liaison. To obtain the Regional Director's signature, please send to:

Roxanne Runkel  
NPS, Intermountain SO-Denver  
Mail address:  
P.O. Box 25287  
Denver, CO 80225-0287  
Phone: (303) 969-2377

Email: [Roxanne\\_Runkel@nps.gov](mailto:Roxanne_Runkel@nps.gov)

Street Address (for express mail only):  
12795 West Alameda Parkway  
Lakewood, CO 80228

### 3. Prepare a Briefing Statement.

A briefing statement (**example 3**) must accompany all notices. The briefing statement should include a bulleted summary of the issues being addressed, what Congressional District(s) could be affected/interested, what public or local government participation and input has been included in the preparation of the document, and an appropriate program contact name and phone number.

The NOA and briefing statement should be e-mailed to Chick Fagan, WASO Ranger Activities, at the same time that the NOA transmittal package is express mailed to Debra Melton (see step #4 below). Chick Fagan can be reached at (202) 208-7469, [Chick\\_Fagan@nps.gov](mailto:Chick_Fagan@nps.gov)

If your project is considered a “hot topic” (there could be enough controversy to raise the project to the Regional Director’s, Director’s, or Secretary’s attention), send a copy of the briefing statement to the Regional Director’s office and brief the Deputy Regional Director or Regional Director before sending the notice to WASO.

### 4. Send the Transmittal Package to the *Federal Register* Liaison.

The transmittal package is then sent to Debra Melton, *Federal Register* Liaison, (202) 354-1904. After the notice is approved, Ms. Melton usually takes the ROD package to the *Federal Register* office within 3-4 working days. Her address is:

Debra Melton  
NPS, Administrative Program Center  
1201 Eye Street, NW  
12<sup>th</sup> Floor, Room 14  
Washington, D.C. 20005

In the unlikely event that you should need it, the *Federal Register* telephone number is (202) 523-3187. With the exception of the ROD itself, the following additional correspondence **does not** require the Regional Director’s signature. Please ensure that your superintendent or project manager/job captain (for IMR and DSC projects) signs the correspondence. The transmittal package must include:

- a) A copy of the ROD (**example 1**).
- b) 3 signed original NOAs and 3 copies (**ORIGINAL NOAs MUST BE SIGNED IN BLUE INK AND MUST BE SINGLE-SIDED AND DOUBLE-SPACED**) (**example 2**).
- c) Briefing Statement (**example 3**)
- d) Cover transmittal memo to *Federal Register* Liaison Office (**example 4**)
- e) Solicitor’s Office memo approving NOA for legal sufficiency (**example 5**).
- f) Hard copy of the purchase request for publication costs (**example 6**). The purchase request should be made out to the *Federal Register*. Costs are \$ 93/page (if formatted per example 2) with disk, a minimum of \$155.00 if there is only one page. The *Federal Register* will only accept payment through a purchase request and will not accept payment from contractors.
- g) A labeled 3.5” floppy disk (not a CD) containing the NOA with only one document per disk. The label should read:

Agency: **DOI/NPS**  
File Name: **NOA[Park].doc** (or whatever the file is named)  
Program Version: **Word 6** (or whatever program it is in)  
Title (spelled out): **Notice of Availability [Park]**

- h) Letter to *Federal Register* Office Director certifying disk is true copy (**example 7**).

**NOTE:** *Acquiring the Regional Director's signature on the NOA is the responsibility of the Intermountain Support Office-Denver. After the ROD and the NOA are signed, the NOA and ROD will be mailed or express mailed back to the park for further processing. It is the park's/team captain's responsibility to send the transmittal package to the Federal Register.*

**5. Obtain clearance to release the ROD.**

On a regular basis, the Washington Office sends a list of notices that are cleared to print to the Support Office. Once your notice appears on that list, the Support Office will notify the park/project contact that the ROD and the NOA are cleared. You may then complete steps 6-8.

**DO NOT COMPLETE STEPS 6-8 WITHOUT THIS CLEARANCE.**

**6. Send cover transmittal memo to the WASO Environmental Quality Division.**

Prepare a cover memo to Jake Hoogland, Chief, Environmental Quality Division (**example 8**). Include **3 copies** of the ROD (example 1), and a copy of the signed NOA (example 2). If additional copies are needed for other offices (e.g. Planning, Ranger Activities, etc.), send copies directly to those offices. Send the package to:

Mr. Jacob J. Hoogland  
Environmental Quality Division  
1201 Eye Street, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 513-7188

**7. Publish/release ROD.**

You must also publish the ROD or a summary of the ROD in the local newspaper of record. A press release example is included (**example 9**).

**8. Confirm NOA publication date.**

The Intermountain Support Office will notify the park after the NOI is published or you may check the Federal Register on-line at <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/>.

## Example 1

**National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior**



**Wupatki National Monument  
Arizona**

---

# **General Management Plan**

## **Record of Decision**

Approved:

---

Karen P. Wade  
Intermountain Regional Director  
National Park Service

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

RECORD OF DECISION

GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Wupatki National Monument

Arizona

**[Instructions/suggestions are in highlighted in yellow and in brackets, delete from final product. Average ROD should be 10 pages. If the preferred alternative proposes actions that would be located in or have adverse effects on floodplains/wetlands, a wetland/ floodplain statement of findings (SOF) must be combined with draft/final EIS. When signed by the regional director, the SOF is attached to the ROD as a separately identifiable document. If the preferred alternative affects a National Register eligible or listed historic property, then the information gathered as a part of the §106 review must be included in the draft/final EIS and the §106 process must be completed before the ROD can be signed. The ROD must include a statement on consultation under §106. All consultation under §7 of the Endangered Species Act must be completed before the ROD can be signed.]**

The Department of the Interior, National Park Service has prepared this Record of Decision on the *General Management Plan/Final Environmental Statement* for Wupatki National Monument. This Record of Decision includes a description of the background of the project, a statement of the decision made, synopses of other alternatives considered, the basis for the decision, findings on impairment of park resources and values, a description of the environmentally preferable alternative, a listing of measures to minimize environmental harm, and an overview of public and agency involvement in the decision-making process.

**BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT**

The purpose of the general management plan is to provide a comprehensive direction for resource preservation and visitor use and a basic foundation for decision making for the monument for the next 15 to 20 years. The plan prescribes the resource conditions and visitor experiences that are to be achieved and maintained in the park over time. The clarification of what must be achieved according to law and policy is based on review of the park's purpose, significance, and special mandates.

**DECISION (SELECTED ACTION)**

**Description of the Selected Action**

*Describe the Preferred Alternative*

**Key Actions**

*If you need to, show bullet list of key provisions of the Preferred Alternative*

**Boundary Expansion**

*For some GMPs, this is an important step, so it can be broken out, if you'd like.*

## **Mitigating Measures/Monitoring**

*[Make a clear statement of which mitigation measures will be implemented if they are not obviously integral to the alternative selected and summarize any monitoring or other enforcement programs or plans. The description of mitigation and monitoring should be specific enough to enable the public to determine whether measures have been effectively implemented, but not be so specific as to duplicate the EIS (DO-12, 6.2A4)]*

## **OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

*Describe the other alternatives that were considered in the final EIS.*

## **BASIS FOR DECISION**

*[Describe the decision rationale—what were the criteria (e.g. cost, degree of environmental impact, technical considerations, degree to which objectives were met, logistics) used in selecting an alternative, how did each alternative measure up against these criteria, how were the criteria weighted, and so forth (DO-12, 6.2A3).]*

## **FINDINGS ON IMPAIRMENT OF PARK RESOURCES AND VALUES**

*[ROD must indicate that, after a review of the impacts, the alternative selected for implementation will not impair park resources or values and will not violate the NPS Organic Act.]*

*Summarize the impact analysis, paying particular attention to any major adverse effects, because impairment is a subset of those effects.*

## **ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

*Using the six criteria spelled out in NEPA's §101, describe the environmentally preferred alternative. You may wish to use something like the following:*

The environmentally preferred alternative is determined by applying the criteria suggested in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), which is guided by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). The CEQ provides direction that "the environmentally preferable alternative is the alternative that will promote the national environmental policy as expressed in NEPA's §101: (1) fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations; (2) assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings; (3) attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradations, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences; (4) preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity, and variety, of individual choice; (5) achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and (6) enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources."

The No-Action Alternative represents the current management direction for Wupatki National Monument. The existing use and development of the park is based on planning initiated and implemented during the Mission 66 program. Personal services interpretation and resource protection patrols are sporadic at each of the four archeological interpretive areas, and the majority of visitors interact with these sites on their own with no on-site NPS presence. For resource protection purposes, areas of the park other than the developed sites and

administrative areas are closed to unguided entry. Because the No-Action Alternative maintains the Mission 66 designed visitor experience, the diversity for educational opportunities and the protection of cultural resources is limited. Protection of cultural resources and visitor opportunities would not be as enhanced as under Alternatives 1, 2, 3, or 4. The No-Action Alternative does not impact access to neighboring lands, unlike Alternatives 2 and 4. The No-Action Alternative does not fully realize provisions 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the goals.

Alternative 1 strives to limit motorized sightseeing in the park and focus on longer and more intensive educational programs to enhance the protection of cultural and natural resources, thus meeting national environmental policy goal 6. This alternative restricts the visitor experience by eliminating the drive-through experience in favor of a longer intensive stay. This alternative also limits access by park neighbors to the Navajo Reservation, ranch land, and USFS lands surrounding the monument. National environmental policy goals 3, 4, and 5 are not fully realized under this alternative to the same extent as in Alternative 4. In addition, it does not fully realize provisions 3 and 5 of the goals when compared with Alternatives 2 and 3.

Alternative 2 promotes improved vehicle access to more of the park for diverse motorized sightseeing experiences and ensures presence of park personnel at popular use areas for visitor contact and site protection purposes. Motorized access to existing popular features would be maintained, and sightseeing would be expanded to new areas. The road to Black Falls Crossing would be opened to park visitors, and existing primitive roads in the north boundary expansion would be used for guided tours along a scenic backcountry loop. Opening the Black Falls Crossing Road to motorized sightseeing could cause congestion for Navajo residents that use the road to commute to Flagstaff and could cause congestion for other American Indians seeking traditional cultural uses in that area. Alternative 2 meets national environmental policy goals 3 and 5 by providing access to more of the park's resources. It does not meet the national environmental policy goal 4 for those groups traditionally associated with the park.

The Preferred Alternative provides for the greatest range of diverse visitor experiences and access to Wupatki National Monument. This alternative would improve upon existing visitor educational opportunities at popular use areas and provide guided access into undeveloped areas of the park. The traffic circulation pattern would remain the same and access to neighboring lands would remain unchanged. Areas of the park not zoned for administrative or visitor use would remain closed to protect resources. The four archeological areas of the park would be gated at night for protection. There may be some increased congestion for American Indians seeking traditional cultural uses from expanded visitor opportunities. The Preferred Alternative would realize each of the applicable provisions of the national environmental policy goals.

Alternative 4 restructures the way visitors gain access to and experience both Wupatki and Sunset Crater Volcano National Monuments to provide a more unified interpretive story and greater protection for natural and cultural resources. FR545 would be modified to a one-way exit road from the existing Wupatki visitor center to the north entrance of the Wupatki. The road would be gated at the beginning of the one-way and closed at night, impacting ranch and Navajo residents who use the road to commute to Flagstaff. Visitor opportunities would decrease with the removal of the visitor center/museum; however, extended learning would still be provided at each of the day use sites. Most of the existing housing, maintenance, and administrative facilities would be removed and the area would be rehabilitated to more closely resemble its historical appearance. Although Alternative 4 would realize most of the applicable provisions of the national environmental policy goals, it would fall short of satisfying criterion 5



by precluding access through the park by park neighbors to the Navajo Reservation, ranch land, and USFS lands surrounding the monument.

The Preferred Alternative is also the environmentally preferred alternative. The Preferred Alternative surpasses the other alternatives in best realizing the full range of national environmental policy goals as stated in §101 of the National Environmental Policy Act. Although other alternatives may achieve greater levels of individual protection for cultural resources or natural resources, or better enhance visitor experience, Alternative 3 overall does (1) provide a high level of protection of natural and cultural resources while concurrently attaining the widest range of neutral and beneficial uses of the environment without degradation; (2) maintain an environment that supports diversity and variety of individual choice; (3) integrate resource protection with an appropriate range of visitor uses; and (4) accommodate the access needs of park neighbors and affiliated American Indian Tribes.

## **PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT**

*You may wish to break your responses down with the following subheadings, but it is not required. We've provided an example below.*

### **Scoping**

The notice of intent (NOI) to prepare this EIS was published in the *Federal Register* May 19, 1997. The NOI indicated availability of newsletter #1, from which comments were accepted until June 30, 1997. The first newsletter described purpose and significance statements for the park, as well as identifying preliminary issues. A second newsletter, released February 1998, detailed public response to the first newsletter, described final purpose and significance statements, and explained the preliminary range of management zones. A third newsletter, issued November 1998, described the range of preliminary alternatives. The fourth newsletter in May 1999 described the decision to prepare a plan concurrently with the Forest Service Flagstaff Lake Mary Ecosystem Area planning process. All comments received through June 1999 were considered in the EIS. The *Purpose of and Need for the Plan*, *Need for the GMP*, and *Description of Scoping Process* sections of the FEIS describe the issues and concerns raised and sort the responses into several categories.

### **Public Meetings and Outreach**

In addition to the newsletters, an open house was held August 20, 1997 to gain information from the public on the park's purpose and significance, issues, and alternatives. To determine if existing park visitors' needs were being met, trip fact sheets were set out at the visitor center. Visitors filled out the sheets voluntarily. The trip fact sheets were a one-page check-off that asked visitors where they were from, why they came to the park, how they preferred to learn about the park, and what they would take advantage of, if it were available. A total of 4,091 trip sheets, spanning a 15-month time frame, were collected and collated.

As a complement to the public meeting, newsletters, and trip fact sheets, a visitor use study was conducted to gather more in-depth information on visitors, their experience, behavior, and how behavior affects resources. Approximately 1,200 mail-back questionnaires were distributed in conjunction with an on-site interview. A total of 295 questionnaires were returned for Wupatki. The on-site survey repeated the questions asked in the trip fact sheets, whereas the mail-back questionnaire provided more detailed information.

Visitors to Wupatki reported that they came to the monument to see archeological ruins and to look at the scenery. Things that most bothered visitors include the heat, smelly rest rooms,



disturbance of the sites, people disobeying rules, and the fact that visitor center displays need modification. A few visitors commented on a lack of signs near the pueblos, unsupervised children, and an overall lack of ranger presence. When asked about what they would like to see changed, most visitors responded, "nothing." Among the changes that some visitors did want were more ranger talks and guided walks and better and more information, including updated exhibits, a video or movie on how the early native people lived, a reconstructed dwelling, more detailed maps, living history, and self-guided tours to the backcountry.

## **Public Comment**

### ***Briefly characterize the public response to the DEIS.***

The National Park Service received 16 comments on the Wupatki National Monument Draft Environmental Impact Statement / Draft General Management Plan. One was from the Hopi Tribe, five were from federal and state agencies, three were from non-governmental organizations, and seven comments were received from individuals.

Most comments from individual expressed opinions about the preferred alternative. Three individuals agreed with the preferred. Three additional commentors agreed generally with the preferred but disliked either the construction of a new visitor contact station near Highway 89, the realignment of the road to Wukoki ruin or both. One individual requested clarification on uses within the monument. Comments from the Hopi Tribe expressed support for Alternative #4, Emphasis the Integrated Story Between the Parks and Minimize Development.

Some of the letters received have ideas that were outside the scope of the general management plan/environmental impact statement. The National Park Service values this input and where applicable it will be taken into account in future plans. Substantive comments were addressed in the final EIS on pages 247-288.

## **Agency and American Indian Consultation and Coordination**

A number of meetings were held with staff from the U.S. Forest Service and Arizona Game and Fish Department. These meetings were held to discuss impacts that the alternatives might have on adjacent recreational activities and impacts to wildlife and their movement corridors and to try to ensure that NPS planning would be in support/harmony with their agency planning efforts. Several of these conversations explored the possibility of joint or co-management of resources and visitor uses.

### ***Add information about §106 and §7 consultation***

In keeping with its mandates for tribal consultation, NPS consulted with many American Indian tribes throughout the planning process. Based on ethnographic research efforts and previous consultations conducted for the Flagstaff Area national monuments during the last several years, ten tribes were identified as having potential traditional associations with park lands and resources. They are the Havasupai Tribe, Hopi Tribe, Hualapai Tribe, Navajo Nation, San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe, Tonto Apache Tribe, White Mountain Apache Tribe, Yavapai Apache Nation, Yavapai-Prescott Tribe, and Zuni Tribe. All ten tribes were contacted by letter and telephone, inviting them to attend an introductory meeting in October 1997. Six of the ten tribes participated in the October meeting, and four participated in a December 1997 consultation meeting. As of February 1998 participating tribes included Hopi, Hualapai, Navajo, White Mountain Apache, Yavapai Apache, Yavapai-Prescott, and Zuni.

At the first two consultation meetings the tribes discussed the purpose and significance statements and agreed on language for the final statements. They also discussed tribal

involvement in identifying culturally significant and sensitive resources as well as plans for participation throughout the planning process. Early in 1998 the Hopi, Navajo, and Zuni Tribes agreed to conduct further NPS-sponsored research into tribal associations with park lands and identify particular sensitive resources and management concerns for the EIS. Representatives from three tribes attended the final tribal consultation meeting in August 1998 and assisted with the development of alternatives. Early in 1999 the Hopi Tribe and Navajo Nation submitted to NPS reports identifying culturally sensitive resources and specific recommendations for the GMP.

All ten tribes originally identified continued to receive newsletters and invitations to consultation meetings throughout the planning process. Tribal interests and concerns were fully considered in the planning process and in the development of alternatives in the GMP.

## **CONCLUSION**

*[make a statement of whether all practical means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the selected alternative have been adopted, and if not, why not (DO-12, 6.2A5). Repeat the impairment determination. Consider using language like the following:]*

As described in the *Mitigation* section, all practical means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the selected alternative have been adopted. Because there would be no major adverse impacts to resources whose conservation is (1) necessary to fulfill specific purposes in the establishing legislation or proclamation for Wupatki National Monument; (2) key to the natural or cultural integrity of the park or to opportunities for enjoyment of the park; or (3) identified as a goal in relevant National Park Service planning documents, there would be no impairment of the park's resources or values. After a review of these effects, the alternative selected for implementation will not impair park resources or values and will not violate the NPS Organic Act.

## Example 2

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[Document or Plan Name], Final Environmental Impact Statement, [Park Name] National [Unit Type], [State]

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Department of the Interior

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability of a Record of Decision on the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the [Plan Name], [Park Name] National [Unit Type]

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to § 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, P.L. 91-190, 83 Stat. 852, 853, codified as amended at 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C), the National Park Service announces the availability of the Record of Decision for the [Plan Name], [Park Name] National [Unit Type] , [State]. On [date], the Director, Intermountain Region approved the Record of Decision for the project. As soon as practicable, the National Park Service will begin to implement the Preferred Alternative contained in the FEIS issued on [date FEIS was published in EPA's Federal Register]. The following course of action will occur under the preferred alternative

[describe the preferred alternative]. This course of action and [#] alternatives were analyzed in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements. The full range of foreseeable environmental consequences was assessed, and appropriate mitigating measures were identified.

The Record of Decision includes a statement of the decision made, synopses of other alternatives considered, the basis for the decision, a description of the environmentally preferable alternative, a finding on impairment of park resources and values, a listing of measures to minimize environmental harm, an overview of public involvement in the decision-making process, and a [Statement of Findings (if appropriate)].

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** [Contact name, address, phone number, e-mail address]

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Copies of the Record of Decision may be obtained from the contact listed above or online at [park web address]

**DATED:** \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

[Name of person who actually signed notice]  
Director, Intermountain Region, National Park Service  
[Add Deputy if needed]

### Example 3

#### BRIEFING STATEMENT TEMPLATE

*Replace information in italics with your text (2-page MAXIMUM)*

**Unit:** *Park Name*

**Title:** *Document Type, project title (e.g. Record of Decision, General Management Plan)*

**Congressional Districts:**

<i>Minnesota</i>	<i>8<sup>th</sup> District</i>	<i>James Oberstar</i>
	<i>Senate</i>	<i>Paul Wellstone, Mark Dayton</i>

*Describe when and at which steps you contacted the delegation. If you briefed other members/staff (e.g. committee), describe those contacts as well.*

**Issues:**

- *Describe the project's process (e.g. The general management plan will conclude with this decision document, which completes a 3-year planning and public participation process. About \_\_ copies of the documents were distributed to the public.)*
- *Describe where we got the authority to do the plan/project. (e.g. The Visitor Use and Facilities Plan segment of the plan was authorized in statute in 1982, but funds for its preparation had never been authorized. When the park commenced its General Management Planning process, it convened a separate Consultation Group of 41 participants to discuss issues related to visitor uses and facilities in the vicinity of the park. The head of the Minnesota Department of Mediation Services served as the facilitator for the group.)*
- *Describe the public review process [e.g. The park conducted 12 public meetings at various stages in the plan – scoping, alternatives, draft – in four locations: International Falls, Orr, Duluth, and the Twin Cities. In addition, the consultation group met 13 times. It consisted of Federal (USFS), State (DNR, Department of Tourism) Provincial (Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources), and local officials (city, county, and lake associations), tourism professionals, and persons experienced in outdoor recreation (University of Minnesota), as directed by the statute. The Visitor Use and Facilities Plan companion document to the General Management Plan was prepared in consultation with that group, also as directed by the statute.]*
- *Summarize the public comment (e.g. There was extraordinary participation in the planning process – over 2000 commented on the draft plan. In spite of the fact that the park has been controversial for much of its 25-year history, there was remarkable unanimity in comments. Most said that they like the park as it is now and sought only to maintain the diversity of uses, the peace and quiet and freedom that characterize recreational experiences in the park now. Most comments suggested more stringent alternatives for management than are presented in the GMP/VUFP/EIS.)*
- *Describe the hot topics and sensitive issues [e.g. The single major issue that generated the most discussion was the question of how many houseboats should be permitted in the park. Until now, there have been no permits required for houseboats (or any other users). The plan calls for a subsequent Houseboat Management Plan once 60 houseboats (overnight) are counted in either of*

*the park's two basins. That subsequent plan will establish the carrying capacity of the park for houseboats. It is anticipated that this threshold (60 boats) will not be reached for several more years since the largest number of houseboats counted to date in a basin is 45.]*

- *Describe how the plan/project addresses the issues (e.g. The plan makes no changes with respect to the types or kinds of motorized and non-motorized use in the park. It has no effect on the existing use of snowmobiles or floatplanes in the park. There are no fees at Voyageurs. There is no fee to enter the park and none is sought by the plan. Because of the difficulties of counting visitors was raised as an issue repeatedly, the park proposes to implement a free, self-registration permit system for overnight users to provide more reliable information, beginning next year.)*
- *Describe input received from state/local officials [e.g. County officials sought an extension in the comment period of 90 days in the fall of 2000. The park granted an extension of 60 days so that the total comment period for the plan was 120 days. (CEQ minimum is 45 days). Only one of the two counties submitted comments. Both counties held their own public hearings on the plan. The transcripts of those hearing are included in the GMP/VUFP/EIS and issues raised in those meetings are responded to, where appropriate.]*
- *Describe input received from Congressional contacts [e.g. A delegation of local officials, accompanied by Senator Dayton (and representatives from other Minnesota Congressional offices), met with NPS Director Fran Mainella, Regional Director Bill Schenk, and others in Washington on September 7, 2001. They requested that the document not be released. The Director indicated that she could find no reason to delay the plan's distribution. Accordingly, when the document was received from the printer, distribution of the plan began.]*
- *Describe media coverage (e.g. Newspaper articles and radio reports on the availability of the plan have appeared in regional media. To date, the park has received no written comments and a few phone calls.)*

**Contact:** *Name, Title, Location, Phone (must be someone who is intimately familiar with the project and can answer all questions)*

## Example 4

(PLACE YOUR PARK/OFFICE LETTERHEAD HERE)

L7617

### Memorandum

To: *Federal Register* Liaison Officer, WASO-237

From: Superintendent,   [Park Name]   National   [Unit Type]   **OR**  
Project Manager/Job Captain,   [Office Title]  

Subject: *Federal Register* publication – Notice of Availability of the Record of Decision on the  
Final Environmental Impact Statement for the   [Plan Name]  ,   [Park Name]    
National   [Unit Type]  

Enclosed are three signed original NOAs and three copies for publication in the *Federal Register*. Also enclosed are copies of the Record of Decision, the [Statement of Findings (if applicable)], the briefing statement, an approved purchase request to cover the costs of publication, a memorandum from the Regional Solicitor's Office approving our standard form of notice for legal sufficiency, a floppy disk containing the notice, and a letter to the Director of the Office of the *Federal Register* stating the disk is certified to be a true copy of the original document.

[Name of Superintendent, Project Manager/Job Captain]

Enclosures [12 or 13]

cc:  
WASO-2310, Hoogland  
IMSO-DE-PE, Runkel



## Example 5

### Solicitor's Office memoranda

The Solicitor's Office memorandum is a document that approves the Record of Decision notice for legal sufficiency. A copy of this memorandum is required by the Federal Register Liaison Officer in order to publicize the notice.

If you use the standard record of decision notice template for your notice, you may use the appropriate Solicitor's Office approval memorandum (see below) as your legal sufficiency memorandum.

#### Office of the Solicitor

#### States

Rocky Mountain Region

Colorado and Wyoming

Southwest Region

Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma

Salt Lake City

Utah

Billings

Montana

These memos are attached as Examples 5A, 5B, 5C, and 5D.

## Example 5A



### United States Department of the Interior

#### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Rocky Mountain Region  
755 Parfet Street, Suite 151  
Lakewood, CO. 80215  
TELE. (303) 231-5353  
FAX (303) 231-5363

March 12, 2002

#### Memorandum

To: Karen Wade, Director  
Intermountain Region, National Park Service

From: Debra Hecox, Acting Assistant Regional Solicitor

Subject: Proposed Federal Register Notice Forms

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Debra Hecox", written over the "From:" line of the memorandum.

Pursuant to your request, we have reviewed the proposed standard form notices of the intent to prepare an environmental impact statement and of the availability of draft and final environmental impact statements and of records of decision. The four forms are approved for legal sufficiency for use in Wyoming and Colorado.

This approval is limited to the referenced draft Federal Register notice forms. No approval is given for any draft environmental documents, general management plans, or similar documents that will be the subject of the Federal Register notices.

## Example 5B



### United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR  
Field Office, Southwest Region  
P.O. Box 1042  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-1042

February 26, 2002

Telefax Only: (303) 969-2644

To: Laurie Comier, National Park Service, Planning and  
Environmental Quality, Denver, CO

From: Arthur Arguedas, Field Solicitor  
Santa Fe, NM

Subject: Federal Register Notices

This office has reviewed the new format for Federal Register  
Notices that you forwarded on February 6, 2002.

We have no legal objection to the new format.

If you have any questions, please call me at (505) 988-6200.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Arthur Arguedas". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a vertical line that extends downwards.

## Example 5C



### United States Department of the Interior

#### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

SUITE 6201, FEDERAL BUILDING  
135 SOUTH STATE STREET  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84138

February 11, 2002

#### Memorandum

To: Director, Intermountain Region, National Park Service

From: Field Solicitor, Salt Lake City Field Office, Pacific Southwest Region

Subject: Review of Documents to be Published in Federal Register

Pursuant to your request, we have reviewed your revised proposed form of notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and your proposed standard notice of availability of draft and final Environmental Impact Statement. Both forms are approved for legal sufficiency.

JOHN STEIGER  
Field Solicitor

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "G. Kevin Jones".

G. KEVIN JONES  
Attorney-Advisor

## Example 5D



### United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR  
P.O. Box 31394  
Billings, Montana 59107-1394

February 12, 2002

NPS.BL.9950

#### MEMORANDUM

TO: Director, Intermountain Region, NPS

FROM: Richard K. Aldrich, Field Solicitor  
Pacific Northwest Region (Billings)

SUBJECT: Review of Standard Format Notices of Intent and Availability

Pursuant to your request, this office has reviewed your revised proposed standard format notices of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and availability of draft and final Environmental Impact Statements. The three forms are approved for legal sufficiency.

If you have any questions concerning our review or the notices, please feel free to contact this office at (406) 247-7583.

## Example 6

<b>Purchase Request</b>  <b>(DRAFT)</b>	<b>Title</b> Federal Register	<b>Document Number</b> R1247030004	<b>Page</b> 1 of 3
	<b>Purchase Request Date</b> 10/24/2002	<b>Acctg Period</b> /	<b>Priority</b>
<b>Requestor</b> Roxanne Runkel (303) 969-2377 ext.		<b>Type of Action</b> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>           Simplified Purchase            Competitive Contract            Non Competitive Contract            Interagency Agreement            Delivery Order         </div> <div>           Task Order            GSA Schedule            Fed. Supply Schedule            8a Contract            Modification         </div> </div>	
<b>Requesting Office</b> IMDC - PE - Planning & Environmental Quality		<b>Ship To</b> IMR - FODA - Fort Davis National Historic Site <b>Attn:</b> Susanna Liddell, Administrative Office Assistant 101 Lt. Flipper Drive  Fort Davis, TX 79734 <b>Phone:</b> (915) 426-3224 ext. 20 <b>Fax:</b> (915) 426-3122 ext.	
<b>Issuing Office</b> IMR - FODA - Fort Davis National Historic Site			
<b>Contact</b>			
<b>Schedule Number</b>  <b>BPA Number</b>  <b>Contract Number</b>			
<b>Suggested Vendor(s)</b> Federal Register		<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Funding</b> \$186.00			
<b>Approval:</b>  <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;">           _____            Signature         </div> <div style="width: 45%;">           _____            Date         </div> </div> <div style="margin-top: 10px;">           _____            Printed Name         </div>			

<b>Line Item Summary</b>		<b>Document Number</b> R1247030004		<b>Title</b> Federal Register		<b>Page</b> 2 of 3					
<b>Total Funding.</b>		S186.00									
<b>FYs</b>	<b>Fund</b>	<b>Budget Org</b>	<b>Sub</b>	<b>Object Class</b>	<b>Sub</b>	<b>Program</b>	<b>Cost Org</b>	<b>Sub</b>	<b>Proj/Job No.</b>	<b>Sub</b>	<b>Reporting Category</b>
2003		1247		262A		409			7012		
<b>Division</b>		<b>Closed FYs</b>		<b>Cancelled Fund</b>							
<b>Line Item Number</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>(Start Date to End Date)</b>		<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Unit of Issue</b>	<b>Unit Price</b>	<b>Total Cost (Includes Discounts)</b>				
0001	Federal Register			1.00	ea	\$180.000	\$ 186.00				
Request to Publish: [Fort Davis NOA FEIS GMP]											
						<b>Total Cost:</b>	<b>\$186.00</b>				



**Address Detail****Title**  
Federal Register**Document Number**  
R1247030004**Page**  
3 of 3**Shipping Addresses**

Code	Detail
0001	<b>Org:</b> IMR - FODA - Fort Davis National Historic Site <b>Addr:</b> 101 Lt. Flipper Drive  Fort Davis TX 79734 <b>Attn:</b> Susanna Liddell, Administrative Office Assistant <b>Phone:</b> (915) 426-3224 ext. 20 <b>Fax:</b> (915) 426-3122 ext.

**Invoice Addresses**

Code	Detail
0001	<b>Org:</b> IMR - FODA - Fort Davis National Historic Site <b>Addr:</b> P.O. Box 1379  Fort Davis Texas 79734-1456 <b>Attn:</b> Jerry Yarbrough, Superintendent <b>Phone:</b> (915) 426-3225 ext. 21 <b>Fax:</b> (915) 426 3122 ext.

**Requisitioning Office Addresses**

Code	Detail
0001	<b>Org:</b> IMDE - PE - Planning & Environmental Quality <b>Addr:</b> National Park Service - IMR-PE P.O. Box 25287  Denver CO 80225-0287 <b>Attn:</b> Wayne Gardner <b>Phone:</b> (303) 969-2833 ext. <b>Fax:</b> ( ) - ext.

## Example 7

(PLACE YOUR PARK/OFFICE LETTERHEAD HERE)

L7617

Ray Mosely, Director  
Office of the *Federal Register*  
800 N. Capitol  
Room 700  
Washington, D.C. 20008

Subject: *Federal Register* publication – Notice of Availability of the Record of Decision for the  
[Plan Name], [Park Name] National [Unit Type]

Dear Mr. Mosely:

We hereby certify that the enclosed disk is a true copy of the original subject document, which is also enclosed.

Sincerely,

[Name of Superintendent]  
[Park Name] National [Unit Type]

OR [Name of Project Manager/Job Captain]  
[Office Title]

Enclosures included in transmittal package

cc:  
IMSO-DE-PE, Runkel

## Example 8

(PLACE YOUR PARK/OFFICE LETTERHEAD HERE)

L7617

[Control Number]

Memorandum

To: Chief, Environmental Quality Division, WASO-2310

From: Superintendent, [Park Name] National [Unit Type] **OR**  
Project Manager/Job Captain, [Office Title]

Subject: Record of Decision, [Plan Name], [Park Name] National [Unit Type],  
[Control Number]

Enclosed for your information are two copies of the Record of Decision for the [Plan Name],  
[Park Name] National [Unit Type], and a copy of the Notice of Availability published in the  
*Federal Register*. We have also included an additional copy of the subject document for the Public  
Affairs Office, and would appreciate it if your office could ensure this copy is delivered. Questions on  
the project may be directed to [Contact name, phone number].

[Name of Superintendent, Project Manager/Job Captain]

Enclosures 4

cc:

IMSO-DE-PE, Runkel

## Example 9



National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior

Intermountain Region

Regional Director's Office  
12795 W. Alameda Pkwy.  
P.O. Box 25287  
Denver, Colorado 80225

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
Date

Contact: phone #

---

## Intermountain Region News Release

### Shuttle system, landscape restoration included in new Devils Tower Management plan

Denver - The National Park Service on June 26 adopted a "Record of Decision" selecting a new long-term management plan for Devils Tower National Monument which calls for the implementation of a new shuttle system to deal with the monument's parking shortage, and conversion of the parking lot currently at the base of the tower into a pedestrian plaza.

The Record of Decision signed by Regional Director Karen Wade is the final step in a multi-year effort to complete a "general management plan" at Devils Tower which will serve as a blueprint for managing visitation, resources, and staffing in the coming years. In preparing general management plans (GMPs), NPS staff seek to determine, with public involvement, how to enhance visitor experiences at parks, and to preserve the resources entrusted to the National Park Service.

Devils Tower began its GMP process in 1998. It held X public meetings to identify the kinds of issues park visitors and nearby residents thought NPS staff ought to consider in developing a long-term management plan. **(Could say something here about what issues surfaced and what we did with them in the plan).** The limited availability of parking at Devils Tower has long been an issue at the monument. Planners have also been concerned about the presence of facilities, including a campground, in the Belle Fourche River floodplain.

In developing the plan, NPS considered five management scenarios and analyzed them for their impacts on the environment and for how well they addressed the concerns, such as limited parking, that ought to be addressed in a long-term plan. The alternatives studied included continuing existing management (the no action alternative), as well as approaches that would emphasize the monument's natural setting by reducing available facilities such as campgrounds or parking lots, as well as approaches that would add facilities to reduce congestion.

-more-

The alternative selected by NPS in its record of decision calls for the implementation of a shuttle system to help ease congestion. Visitors will board shuttles outside monument boundaries, at a staging area that would include restrooms, bookstore, and picnic sites. Visitors during peak visitation times would be required to use the shuttle system, or walk or bike into the monument.

The alternative selected by NPS also calls for the removal of campground and other facilities at the Belle Fourche River and restoration of the area to its natural condition. Although some public support was expressed for keeping the campground, park planners were concerned about the continued possibility of flooding, the rising costs of maintaining the campground, and the need to replace much of the campground's infrastructure. Park planners concluded that it was unwise to spend large sums repairing a facility that is prone to flooding.

The alternative selected by NPS also calls for eliminating the parking lot at the base of the tower and replacing it with a landscaped pedestrian plaza. Replacing the lot with a landscaped plaza will help improve the noise level at the base of the tower and make the area more friendly to pedestrians.

For further information about the plan, visit the Devils Tower website at [www.nps.gov/deto](http://www.nps.gov/deto), or you may contact the monument superintendent, Lisa Eckhert, at P.O. Box 10, Devils Tower, Wyoming 82714; (307) 467-5283; [deto\\_planning@nps.gov](mailto:deto_planning@nps.gov).

###